

1 MARK A. KLEIMAN (SBN 115919)  
 2 LAW OFFICE OF MARK ALLEN  
 3 KLEIMAN  
 4 2907 Stanford Ave. Venice, CA 90292  
 Telephone: (310) 306-8094  
 Facsimile: (310) 306-8491  
 Email: [mkleiman@quitam.org](mailto:mkleiman@quitam.org)

5 BEN GHARAGOZLI (SBN 272302)  
 6 LAW OFFICES OF BEN GHARAGOZLI  
 7 18336 Soledad Canyon Road, #2241  
 Canyon Country, CA 91386  
 Telephone: (661) 607-4665  
 Facsimile: (855) 628-5517  
 Email: [ben.gharagozli@gmail.com](mailto:ben.gharagozli@gmail.com)

ALAN F. HUNTER (SBN 99805)  
 ELIZABETH GONG LANDESS  
 (SBN 138353)  
 GAVIN, CUNNINGHAM & HUNTER  
 1530 The Alameda, Suite 210  
 San Jose, CA 95126  
 Telephone: (408) 294-8500  
 Facsimile: (408) 294-8596  
 Email: [hunter@gclitigation.com](mailto:hunter@gclitigation.com)  
[landess@gclitigation.com](mailto:landess@gclitigation.com)  
 Attorneys for RABAB ABDULHADI

10  
 11 ELIOT LEE GROSSMAN (SBN 76629)  
 12 LAW OFFICE OF ELIOT LEE  
 GROSSMAN  
 13 530 S Lake Ave. #731, Pasadena, CA 91101  
 Telephone: (626) 642-6279  
 Email: [innjustice@protonmail.com](mailto:innjustice@protonmail.com)  
 Of Counsel

14  
 15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 16 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

17 JACOB MANDEL, CHARLES VOLK, LIAM  
 18 KERN, MASHA MERKULOVA, AARON  
 PARKER, and STEPHANIE ROSEKIND;

19 Plaintiffs,  
 20 v.

21 BOARD OF TRUSTEES of the CALIFORNIA  
 22 STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN FRANCISCO  
 23 STATE UNIVERSITY, et al.;

24 Defendants.

25 ) Case No.: 3:17-CV-03511-WHO  
 )  
 ) **NOTICE OF MOTION AND**  
 ) **MOTION TO DISMISS**  
 ) **COMPLAINT**  
 )  
 ) **(Filed concurrently with Motion to**  
 ) **Strike and [Proposed] Order)**  
 )  
 ) Date: November 8, 2017  
 ) Time: 2:00 p.m.  
 ) Location: Courtroom 2 (17<sup>th</sup> Floor)  
 ) Judge: William H. Orrick  
 ) Original Action Filed: June 19, 2017  
 )  
 )

26 **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS**

27 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on November 8, 2017, at 2 pm before the Honorable  
 28 William H. Orrick in Courtroom 2 on the 17<sup>th</sup> floor of the above-entitled Court located at 450

---

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

1 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102-3489, RABAB ABDULHADI, Ph.D. ("Dr.  
 2 Abdulhadi") will move pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure  
 3 ("FRCP") to dismiss as to her the First through Sixth Causes of action (i.e. "Claims for Relief) in  
 4 Plaintiffs' Complaint filed on June 19, 2017.  
 5

6 Dr. Abdulhadi respectfully moves the Court to dismiss the Complaint without leave to  
 7 amend pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) for the following reasons:

- 8 (1) Dr. Abdulhadi is not named as a defendant anywhere in the body of the Complaint.
- 9 (2) The allegations Plaintiffs assert against Dr. Abdulhadi do not give rise to any cause  
 10 of action and have no relevance to any of the current purported causes of action.
- 11 (3) Plaintiffs basically complain that they disagree with Dr. Abdulhadi's political views  
 12 and activities, all of which are protected by the First Amendment, and none of which  
 13 actually harmed Plaintiffs.
- 14 (4) Even though there are no allegations that Dr. Abdulhadi was acting in her individual  
 15 capacity, were Plaintiffs to make such allegations they could never overcome the  
 16 qualified immunity Dr. Abdulhadi enjoys since they cannot allege that she violated  
 17 any clearly established rights or show they are entitled to declaratory relief..
- 18 (5) Given the sham nature of these allegations against her, there is no reason to make Dr.  
 19 Abdulhadi suffer through another round of pleadings. As to her, the Complaint  
 20 should be dismissed with prejudice.

21 This Motion is based upon the Memorandum of Points and Authorities included herein,  
 22 the existing record in this matter, and any such additional authority and argument as may be  
 23 advanced in Dr. Abdulhadi's reply and during argument on this Motion.  
 24

---

25 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

1 DATED: August 21, 2017

2 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

3  
4 **LAW OFFICE OF MARK ALLEN KLEIMAN**5  
6 By: /s/ Mark Allen Kleiman, Esq.7  
8 Mark Allen Kleiman, Esq.9  
10 **LAW OFFICES OF BEN GHARAGOZLI**

11 Ben Gharagozli, Esq.

12 **GAVIN, CUNNINGHAM & HUNTER**

13 Alan F. Hunter, Esq.

14 Elizabeth Gong Landess, Esq.

15 Attorneys for Dr. Abdulhadi

16 **LAW OFFICE OF ELIOT LEE GROSSMAN**

17 Eliot Lee, Grossman, Esq.

18 Of Counsel

19  
20 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
<b><u>TABLE OF AUTHORITIES</u></b> .....	5
<b><u>STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED</u></b> .....	7
<b><u>MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES</u></b> .....	8
I. SUCCINCT STATEMENT OF RELEVANT FACTS.....	8
II. ARGUMENT .....	9
A. Incorporation of Moving Papers Submitted by the University and the Named Individual Defendants.....	9
B. Plaintiffs Fail to Properly Name Dr. Abdulhadi as a Defendant .....	10
C. Plaintiffs' Allegations Against Dr. Abdulhadi Do Not Give Rise to Any Feasible Cause of Action .....	11
1) Co-Funding a Political Organization .....	13

29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
5510  
5511  
5512  
5513  
5514  
5515  
5516  
5517  
5518  
5519  
5520  
5521  
5522  
5523  
5524  
5525  
5526  
5527  
5528  
5529  
5530  
5531  
5532  
5533  
5534  
5535  
5536  
5537  
5538  
5539  
55310  
55311  
55312  
55313  
55314  
55315  
55316  
55317  
55318  
55319  
55320  
55321  
55322  
55323  
55324  
55325  
55326  
55327  
55328  
55329  
55330  
55331  
55332  
55333  
55334  
55335  
55336  
55337  
55338  
55339  
55340  
55341  
55342  
55343  
55344  
55345  
55346  
55347  
55348  
55349  
55350  
55351  
55352  
55353  
55354  
55355  
55356  
55357  
55358  
55359  
55360  
55361  
55362  
55363  
55364  
55365  
55366  
55367  
55368  
55369  
55370  
55371  
55372  
55373  
55374  
55375  
55376  
55377  
55378  
55379  
55380  
55381  
55382  
55383  
55384  
55385  
55386  
55387  
55388  
55389  
55390  
55391  
55392  
55393  
55394  
55395  
55396  
55397  
55398  
55399  
553100  
553101  
553102  
553103  
553104  
553105  
553106  
553107  
553108  
553109  
553110  
553111  
553112  
553113  
553114  
553115  
553116  
553117  
553118  
553119  
553120  
553121  
553122  
553123  
553124  
553125  
553126  
553127  
553128  
553129  
553130  
553131  
553132  
553133  
553134  
553135  
553136  
553137  
553138  
553139  
553140  
553141  
553142  
553143  
553144  
553145  
553146  
553147  
553148  
553149  
553150  
553151  
553152  
553153  
553154  
553155  
553156  
553157  
553158  
553159  
553160  
553161  
553162  
553163  
553164  
553165  
553166  
553167  
553168  
553169  
553170  
553171  
553172  
553173  
553174  
553175  
553176  
553177  
553178  
553179  
553180  
553181  
553182  
553183  
553184  
553185  
553186  
553187  
553188  
553189  
553190  
553191  
553192  
553193  
553194  
553195  
553196  
553197  
553198  
553199  
553200  
553201  
553202  
553203  
553204  
553205  
553206  
553207  
553208  
553209  
553210  
553211  
553212  
553213  
553214  
553215  
553216  
553217  
553218  
553219  
553220  
553221  
553222  
553223  
553224  
553225  
553226  
553227  
553228  
553229  
553230  
553231  
553232  
553233  
553234  
553235  
553236  
553237  
553238  
553239  
553240  
553241  
553242  
553243  
553244  
553245  
553246  
553247  
553248  
553249  
553250  
553251  
553252  
553253  
553254  
553255  
553256  
553257  
553258  
553259  
553260  
553261  
553262  
553263  
553264  
553265  
553266  
553267  
553268  
553269  
553270  
553271  
553272  
553273  
553274  
553275  
553276  
553277  
553278  
553279  
553280  
553281  
553282  
553283  
553284  
553285  
553286  
553287  
553288  
553289  
553290  
553291  
553292  
553293  
553294  
553295  
553296  
553297  
553298  
553299  
553300  
553301  
553302  
553303  
553304  
553305  
553306  
553307  
553308  
553309  
553310  
553311  
553312  
553313  
553314  
553315  
553316  
553317  
553318  
553319  
553320  
553321  
553322  
553323  
553324  
553325  
553326  
553327  
553328  
553329  
553330  
553331  
553332  
553333  
553334  
553335  
553336  
553337  
553338  
553339  
5533310  
5533311  
5533312  
5533313  
5533314  
5533315  
5533316  
5533317  
5533318  
5533319  
55333110  
55333111  
55333112  
55333113  
55333114  
55333115  
55333116  
55333117  
55333118  
55333119  
553331110  
553331111  
553331112  
553331113  
553331114  
553331115  
553331116  
553331117  
553331118  
553331119  
5533311110  
5533311111  
5533311112  
5533311113  
5533311114  
5533311115  
5533311116  
5533311117  
5533311118  
5533311119  
55333111110  
55333111111  
55333111112  
55333111113  
55333111114  
55333111115  
55333111116  
55333111117  
55333111118  
55333111119  
553331111110  
553331111111  
553331111112  
553331111113  
553331111114  
553331111115  
553331111116  
553331111117  
553331111118  
553331111119  
5533311111110  
5533311111111  
5533311111112  
5533311111113  
5533311111114  
5533311111115  
5533311111116  
5533311111117  
5533311111118  
5533311111119  
55333111111110  
55333111111111  
55333111111112  
55333111111113  
55333111111114  
55333111111115  
55333111111116  
55333111111117  
55333111111118  
55333111111119  
553331111111110  
553331111111111  
553331111111112  
553331111111113  
553331111111114  
553331111111115  
553331111111116  
553331111111117  
553331111111118  
553331111111119  
5533311111111110  
5533311111111111  
5533311111111112  
5533311111111113  
5533311111111114  
5533311111111115  
5533311111111116  
5533311111111117  
5533311111111118  
5533311111111119  
55333111111111110  
55333111111111111  
55333111111111112  
55333111111111113  
55333111111111114  
55333111111111115  
55333111111111116  
55333111111111117  
55333111111111118  
55333111111111119  
553331111111111110  
553331111111111111  
553331111111111112  
553331111111111113  
553331111111111114  
553331111111111115  
553331111111111116  
553331111111111117  
553331111111111118  
553331111111111119  
5533311111111111110  
5533311111111111111  
5533311111111111112  
5533311111111111113  
5533311111111111114  
5533311111111111115  
5533311111111111116  
5533311111111111117  
5533311111111111118  
5533311111111111119  
55333111111111111110  
55333111111111111111  
55333111111111111112  
55333111111111111113  
55333111111111111114  
55333111111111111115  
55333111111111111116  
55333111111111111117  
55333111111111111118  
55333111111111111119  
553331111111111111110  
553331111111111111111  
553331111111111111112  
553331111111111111113  
553331111111111111114  
553331111111111111115  
553331111111111111116  
553331111111111111117  
553331111111111111118  
553331111111111111119  
5533311111111111111110  
5533311111111111111111  
5533311111111111111112  
5533311111111111111113  
5533311111111111111114  
5533311111111111111115  
5533311111111111111116  
5533311111111111111117  
5533311111111111111118  
5533311111111111111119  
55333111111111111111110  
55333111111111111111111  
55333111111111111111112  
55333111111111111111113  
55333111111111111111114  
55333111111111111111115  
55333111111111111111116  
55333111111111111111117  
55333111111111111111118  
55333111111111111111119  
553331111111111111111110  
553331111111111111111111  
553331111111111111111112  
553331111111111111111113  
553331111111111111111114  
553331111111111111111115  
553331111111111111111116  
553331111111111111111117  
553331111111111111111118  
553331111111111111111119  
5533311111111111111111110  
5533311111111111111111111  
5533311111111111111111112  
5533311111111111111111113  
5533311111111111111111114  
5533311111111111111111115  
5533311111111111111111116  
5533311111111111111111117  
5533311111111111111111118  
5533311111111111111111119  
55333111111111111111111110  
55333111111111111111111111  
55333111111111111111111112  
55333111111111111111111113  
55333111111111111111111114  
55333111111111111111111115  
55333111111111111111111116  
55333111111111111111111117  
55333111111111111111111118  
55333111111111111111111119  
553331111111111111111111110  
553331111111111111111111111  
553331111111111111111111112  
553331111111111111111111113  
553331111111111111111111114  
553331111111111111111111115  
553331111111111111111111116  
553331111111111111111111117  
553331111111111111111111118  
553331111111111111111111119  
5533311111111111111111111110  
5533311111111111111111111111  
5533311111111111111111111112  
5533311111111111111111111113  
5533311111111111111111111114  
5533311111111111111111111115  
5533311111111111111111111116  
5533311111111111111111111117  
5533311111111111111111111118  
5533311111111111111111111119  
55333111111111111111111111110  
55333111111111111111111111111  
55333111111111111111111111112  
55333111111111111111111111113  
55333111111111111111111111114  
55333111111111111111111111115  
55333111111111111111111111116  
55333111111111111111111111117  
55333111111111111111111111118  
55333111111111111111111111119  
553331111111111111111111111110  
553331111111111111111111111111  
553331111111111111111111111112  
553331111111111111111111111113  
553331111111111111111111111114  
553331111111111111111111111115  
553331111111111111111111111116  
553331111111111111111111111117  
553331111111111111111111111118  
553331111111111111111111111119<br

1	2) "Integral involvement" in Academic and Political Events.....	13
2	3) Research in the Middle East.....	14
3	4) Student Exchange Program .....	15
4	5) Faculty Adviser of GUPS.....	15
5	6) Politicizing Grades .....	16
6	D. Dr. Abdulhadi Enjoys Qualified Immunity From Liability for the First Four Causes of Action .....	16
7	E. In Her Individual Capacity, Dr. Abdulhadi Enjoys Qualified Immunity From Liability for the Sixth Cause of Action Because Declaratory Judgment via the Declaratory Judgment Act and via 42 U.S.C. §1983 are Identical.....	17
8	F. Plaintiffs Fail to Establish Subject Matter Jurisdiction .....	18
9	1) Plaintiffs' Cause of Action for Declaratory Relief Fails to State an Actual Controversy.....	18
10	2) The Plaintiffs Lack Standing to Bring a Claim for Declaratory Relief Against Dr. Abdulhadi .....	20
11	3) Plaintiffs' Purported Sixth Cause of Action Fail to Provide Fair Notice of the Basis for Relief .....	21
12	G. The Eleventh Amendment Bars Plaintiffs' Monetary Claims Against Dr. Abdulhadi.....	22
13	H. Plaintiffs Do Not Deserve Leave to Amend .....	24
14	III. CONCLUSION.....	24
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

---

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<u>Page</u>
Abbott Labs. v. Gardner, 387 U.S. 136 (1967).....	21
al-Kidd v. Ashcroft, 580 F.3d, 949 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2009) .....	14, 17
Arnold v. International Business Machines Corp., 637 F.2d 1350 (9th Cir. 1981) .....	12
Bahn v. Korean Airlines Co. (In re Korean Air Lines Co.), 642 F.3d 685 (9th Cir. 2011) .....	24
Biodiversity Legal v. Badgley, 309 F.3d 1166 (9th Cir. 2002) .....	19
Buckley v. Valeo, 424 US 1 (1976).....	19
Chevron Corp. v. Camacho Naranjo, 667 F.3d 232 (2nd Cir. 2012).....	17
City of Los Angeles v. Lyons, 461 U.S. 95 (1983) .....	21
Cone Corp. v. Florida Dep’t of Transp., 921 F.2d 1190 (11th Cir. 1991).....	20
Courtright v. City of Battle Creek, 839 F.3d 513 (6th Cir. 2016) .....	17
Del Monte Int’l GmbH v. Del Monte Corp., 995 F.Supp.2d 1107 (C.D. Cal. 2014) .....	17
Ervine v. Desert View Regional Medical Center Holdings, LLC, 753 F.2d 862 (9th Cir. 2014) .....	20
Ex parte Young, 209 U.S. 123 (1908) .....	22, 23
Green v. Mansour, 474 U.S. 64 (1985).....	22
Groten v. California, 251 F.3d 844 (9th Cir. 2001).....	17
Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800 (1982) .....	16, 17
Healy v. James, 408 U.S. 169 (1972) .....	19
Hodgers-Durgin v. De La Vina, 199 F.3d 1037 (9th Cir. 1999) .....	20
Hoffman v. Halden, 268 F.2d 280 (9th Cir. 1959) .....	10, 11

---

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

1	Hummel v. Northwest Trustee Servs. 180 F.Supp.3d 798 (W.D. Wash. 2016) .....	18
2	In re Asbestos School Litigation 46 F.3d 1284 (3rd Cir. 1994) .....	20
3	In re Orthopedic Bone Screw Litigation, 193 F.3d 781 (3rd Cir. 1999).....	19
4	Jackson v. Hayakawa, 682 F.2d 1344 (9th Cir. 1982).....	22, 24
5	Jones v Williams, 297 F.3d 930 (9th Cir. 2002).....	12
6	Kaplan v. Rose, 49 F.3d 1363 (9th Cir. 1994).....	24
7	Keyishian v. Bd. of Regents, Univ. of State of N.Y, 385 U.S. 589 (1967) .....	19
8	Mitchell v. Los Angeles Community College District, 861 F.2d 198 (9th Cir. 1988) .....	24
9	Moss v. United States Secret Service 572 F.3d 969 (2009) .....	14
10	Moss v. United States Secret Service, 711 F.3d 941(9th Cir. 2013) .....	16
11	Nevijel v. N. Coast Life Ins. Co., 651 F.2d 671 (9th Cir. 1981) .....	9
12	Nix v. Norman, 879 F.2d 429 (8 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989) .....	23
13	Papasan v. Allain, 478 U.S. 265 (1986) .....	22
14	Rice v. Hamilton Air Force Base Commissary, 720 F.2d 1082, (9th Cir. 1983) .....	10, 11
15	Skelly Oil v. Phillips Petroleum, 339 US 667 (1950).....	18
16	Starr v. Baca, 633 F.3d 1191 (9th Cir. 2011) .....	9
17	Sutton v. Providence St. Joseph Medical Center, 192 F.3d 826 (9th Cir. 1999) .....	12
18	Sweezy v. State of New Hampshire., 354 U.S. 234 (1957).....	19
19	Tahoe-Sierra Preservation Council v. Tahoe Reg'l Planning Agency, 216 F.3d 764 (9 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000).....	12
20	Tyrolf v. Veterans' Administration, 82 F.R.D. 372 (E.D. La. 1979) .....	10, 11
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

---

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

1	Whitmore v. Arkansas, 495 U.S. 149 (1990) .....	20
2	Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police, 491 U.S. 58.....	22
3	Williams v. Alabama State Univ., 102 F.3d 1179 (11th Cir. 1997) .....	17

4

**Federal Rules of Civil Procedure**

5	Rule 8(a)(2).....	9
7	Rule 15(a)(2).....	24

8

**STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED**

9

10 1. Whether a person who is listed as a defendant only in the caption of the Complaint and not  
11 in the description of parties or anywhere else is truly a defendant in the action.

12 2. Whether the allegations made against Dr. Abdulhadi, taken as true, allege any facts showing  
13 that she directly caused any of the Plaintiffs any harm to a constitutionally protected right or  
14 interest.

15 3. Whether the allegations against Dr. Abdulhadi concern speech and activities, protected by  
16 the First Amendment.

17 4. Even if the plaintiffs were somehow able to credibly allege that the speech and activities  
18 undertaken by Dr. Abdulhadi were undertaken in her individual capacity, whether any of  
19 them violated a constitutional right of Plaintiffs that was clearly established in light of the  
20 specific context of the case.

21 5. Whether any of the Plaintiffs are able to credibly allege a likelihood that they will again  
22 suffer injury to a clearly established constitutionally protected interest at the hands of Dr.  
23 Abdulhadi.

24 6. Whether the Eleventh Amendment Bars Plaintiffs' Claims Against Dr. Abdulhadi.

25

26

---

27 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

7. Whether, given the nature of these pleadings, the interests of justice would be served by denying Plaintiffs leave to amend.

## **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

**I) SUCCINCT STATEMENT OF THE RELEVANT FACTS**

Since the local rules only require recitation of the relevant facts, and so very few of the facts advanced by Plaintiffs are relevant, it is easy to be succinct in this section. Essentially, Plaintiffs have brought suit against a number of individuals because they disagree with their political views.

In a 73-page Complaint, Plaintiffs demand legal and equitable relief for purported civil rights violations without ever naming Dr. Abdulhadi as a defendant. Most of the allegations constitute irrelevant propaganda that goes back to as far as 1968 and rely on an intentionally distorted and self-serving understanding of anti-Semitism. The essence of Plaintiffs' grievance concerns two claims: (1) student protest of an event where Nir Barkat, the Mayor of Jerusalem intended to speak on April 6, 2016; (2) the alleged exclusion of the Hillel organization from a "Know Your Rights" Fair in February 2017. The Complaint contains no allegations that Dr. Abdulhadi was involved in either of these incidents.

Curiously, Plaintiffs attribute six actions to Dr. Abdulhadi that are completely unrelated to these two events. Plaintiffs complain that Dr. Abdulhadi (1) acted as a faculty adviser of the General Union of Palestine Students (“GUPS”)<sup>1</sup>; (2) co-founded the U.S. Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel<sup>2</sup>; (3) participated in political events;<sup>3</sup> (4) traveled to the

<sup>1</sup> Complaint, p. 14, para. 53.

<sup>2</sup> Complaint p. 15, para. 56

<sup>3</sup> Complaint, p. 16, para. 57-59

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

1 Middle East to conduct research in 2014,<sup>4</sup> (5) helped develop a student exchange program  
 2 between San Francisco State University (SFSU) and An-Najah National University in Palestine;<sup>5</sup>  
 3 (6) downgraded students in her class based on political views rather than merit.<sup>6</sup> Despite (or  
 4 perhaps because of) the absence of any relationship between these assertions and Plaintiffs'  
 5 claimed injuries Plaintiffs never state that Dr. Abdulhadi has somehow harmed them, and do not  
 6 even describe her as a party in the body of the Complaint. Although Dr. Abdulhadi does not  
 7 know if she *is* actually a defendant, since the Sixth Cause of Action seeks relief against "all  
 8 Defendants", out of an abundance of caution, Dr. Abdulhadi moves for dismissal of the  
 9 Complaint..

12 **II) ARGUMENT**

13 Rule 8(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP) requires "a short and plain  
 14 statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." The "allegations in a  
 15 complaint . . . must be sufficiently detailed to give fair notice to the opposing party of the nature  
 16 of the claim so that the party may effectively defend against it." Starr v. Baca, 633 F.3d 1191,  
 17 1204 (9th Cir. 2011). Since this Complaint fails to meet even these standards it should be  
 18 dismissed. See Nevijel v. N. Coast Life Ins. Co., 651 F.2d 671, 673 (9th Cir. 1981).

20 **A) Incorporation of Moving Papers Submitted by the University and  
 21 the Named Individual Defendants.**

22 The University and the individually named defendants in this matter have filed related  
 23 motions to dismiss and strike. To the extent favorable to Dr. Abdulhadi, Dr. Abdulhadi hereby  
 24

---

25  
 26 <sup>4</sup> Complaint, p. 52, para 133.  
 27 <sup>5</sup> Complaint, p. 53, para. 135.  
 28 <sup>6</sup> Alleged purely upon information and belief, Complaint, p. 53, para. 136.

---

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

1 incorporates all of the defendants' arguments to the extent they are not inconsistent with the  
 2 arguments asserted herein and limited to the first, second, third, fourth and sixth purported  
 3 causes of action.  
 4

5 **B) Plaintiffs Fail to Properly Name Dr. Abdulhadi as a Defendant.**

6 The allegations in the body of the Complaint, rather than the caption page, determine  
 7 whether someone is or is not a defendant in a lawsuit. Hoffman v. Halden, 268 F.2d 280, 303-  
 8 304 (9th Cir. 1959); [reaffirmed in Rice v. Hamilton Air Force Base Commissary, 720 F.2d  
 9 1082, 1085 (9th Cir. 1983)]; see also Tyrolf v. Veterans' Administration, 82 F.R.D. 372, 374-375  
 10 (E.D. La. 1979).

12 Plaintiffs specifically name the various defendants in the present lawsuit at pages 6 to 10  
 13 of the Complaint. Dr. Abdulhadi is absent from this list and is therefore not a defendant in  
 14 Plaintiffs' Complaint and any purported causes of action against her must fail as a matter of law.

15 Although Plaintiffs' Sixth Claim for Relief is asserted against all defendants,<sup>7</sup> Dr.  
 16 Abdulhadi is not alleged to be a defendant in this action anywhere in the body of the Complaint.  
 17 Since it is the allegations in the body of the Complaint which determine who is a defendant in the  
 18 action, as held in Hoffman, Rice, and Tyrolf, supra, and the Sixth Claim for Relief is clearly not  
 19 pled against Dr. Abdulhadi, it should be dismissed with prejudice as to her.  
 20

21 Plaintiffs' first and second purported causes of action begin by stating that each is  
 22 asserted against 11 individually named defendants, but Dr. Abdulhadi is not amongst them.<sup>8</sup> The  
 23 Third and Fourth Causes of Action are asserted against 9 named defendants, referred to therein  
 24

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
 27 <sup>7</sup> Complaint, p. 70: 22.  
 28 <sup>8</sup> Complaint, p. 61:12-13; p. 63: 6-8.

1 as the “KYR Individual Defendants”, and again Dr. Abdulhadi is not named as one of them.<sup>9</sup> <sup>10</sup>  
 2 The Fifth Cause of Action under Title VI is pled only against California State University  
 3 (“CSU”) and San Francisco State University (“SFSU”).<sup>11</sup>  
 4

5 Since it is the allegations in the body of the Complaint which determine who is a  
 6 defendant in the action,<sup>12</sup> and the allegations in the first, second, third, fourth and fifth Claims for  
 7 Relief explicitly exclude Dr. Abdulhadi from the defendants against whom they are pled, these  
 8 claims should also be dismissed with prejudice as to her.

9

10 **C) Plaintiffs’ Allegations Against Dr. Abdulhadi Do Not Give Rise to Any  
 11 Feasible Cause of Action.**

12 Plaintiffs seek to inflict “massive punishments” upon Dr. Abdulhadi<sup>13</sup> for the following  
 13 sins: (1) being a faculty adviser to a registered campus student group, the GUPS<sup>14</sup>; (2) co-  
 14 founding the U.S. Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel<sup>15</sup>; (3) being  
 15 involved with political events<sup>16</sup>; (4) traveling to the Middle East to conduct research in 2014<sup>17</sup>;  
 16 (5) helping develop a student exchange program between SFSU and An-Najah National  
 17  
 18  
 19

---

20 <sup>9</sup> Complaint, p. 65: 4-6.

21 <sup>10</sup> Complaint, p. 67: 4-5.

22 <sup>11</sup> Complaint, p. 69: 3-4.

23 <sup>12</sup> See Hoffman, Rice, and Tyrolf, supra.

24 <sup>13</sup> Speech by plaintiffs’ counsel, Brooke Goldstein: “The goal is to ... to send a message, a  
 25 deterrent message, that similar actions such as those that they engage in will result in massive  
 26 punishments.” <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iSm22DhzC6k>, at 30:47-30:56 in the video.  
 27 Last accessed August 19, 2017. Dr. Abdulhadi does not advance these remarks as a separate  
 28 basis for ordering dismissal, but to give the Court a better understanding of the assumptive bases  
 of the Complaint.

<sup>14</sup> Complaint, p. 14, para. 53.

<sup>15</sup> Complaint, p. 15, para. 56

<sup>16</sup> Complaint, p. 16, para. 57-59,

<sup>17</sup> Complaint, p. 52, para 133.

1 University in Palestine<sup>18</sup>; and (6) grading students in her class based on political preferences  
 2 rather than merit.<sup>19</sup> Even if every word were true, there is no nexus to the alleged protest of  
 3 Mayor Barkat's speech or Hillel's alleged exclusion from the "Know Your Rights" Fair.  
 4

5 Most importantly, Plaintiffs do not, and indeed can not show that any of Dr. Abdulhadi's  
 6 alleged conduct caused them harm, which is doubtless why Dr. Abdulhadi went unnamed in the  
 7 first five causes of action. =There are no allegations that Dr. Abdulhadi's conduct harmed  
 8 Plaintiffs' rights or directly injured them. On this basis alone, the Complaint fails as to Dr.  
 9 Abdulhadi. The first four causes of action are all grounded in 42 U.S.C. §1983, to which charges  
 10 of vicarious liability are simply inapplicable. Defendants do not, and indeed can not allege that  
 11 Dr. Abdulhadi was somehow involved in depriving them of their rights. Jones v Williams, 297  
 12 F.3d 930, 934 (9th Cir. 2002). The plaintiffs must allege facts sufficient to raise the allegation  
 13 that Dr. Abdulhadi's conduct was the actionable cause of their claimed injuries. Tahoe-Sierra  
 14 Preservation Council, Inc. v. Tahoe Reg'l Planning Agency, 216 F.3d 764, 783 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.) 2000.  
 15 The Plaintiffs have utterly failed to allege any nexus between Dr. Abdulhadi and the alleged  
 16 denial of their civil rights. Arnold v. International Business Machines Corp., 637 F.2d 1350,  
 17 1356-1357 (9th Cir. 1981). Whether the courts treat this as a question of "proximate cause" or a  
 18 question of whether Dr. Abdulhadi, were she alleged to be acting as an individual, acted under  
 19 "color of state law", their claim still fails as it cannot show a nexus between her and any of the  
 20 other defendants' allegedly wrongful acts, a required element of these cases. Sutton v.  
 21 Providence St. Joseph Medical Center, 192 F.3d 826, 838, fn. 5 (9th Cir. 1999).  
 22

23  
 24  
 25  
 26<sup>18</sup> Complaint, p. 53, para. 135.  
 27<sup>19</sup> Complaint, p. 53, para. 136.  
 28

1 In sum, the stated allegations on their face fail to implicate adverse legal interests and fail  
 2 to establish real and non-speculative injuries to Plaintiffs. For this reason, the entire complaint  
 3 should be dismissed as to Dr. Abdulhadi.  
 4

5 1) Co-Founding a Political Organization

6 Plaintiffs complain that Dr. Abdulhadi “co-founded the U.S. Campaign for the Academic  
 7 and Cultural Boycott of Israel.”<sup>20</sup> Although it is entirely unclear how this allegation could  
 8 conceivably create a cause of action against Dr. Abdulhadi especially since this organization  
 9 does not appear anywhere else in the Complaint, it speaks volumes about why Dr. Abdulhadi has  
 10 been sued – to punish her for advocating justice for/in Palestine.  
 11

12 2) “Integral involvement” in Academic and Political Events

13 Plaintiffs seek to punish Dr. Abdulhadi for criticizing Israel and apparently want to enjoin  
 14 her from speaking out in the future in a way that is not consistent with their political beliefs. The  
 15 irony that a lawsuit demanding relief for violations of civil rights is merely a cloak to suppress  
 16 freedom of expression reveals the inherent frivolity of Plaintiffs’ claims.  
 17

18 Plaintiffs object to three of Dr. Abdulhadi’s alleged political actions: (a) speaking at an  
 19 academic conference<sup>21</sup>; (b) drafting a brochure in honor of the inauguration of the Palestinian  
 20 mural;<sup>22</sup> (c) being “integrally involved” in other academic conferences (that occurred in 2009)  
 21 that Plaintiffs describe as anti-Israeli.<sup>23</sup>  
 22

23 These are classic examples of Dr. Abdulhadi exercising her First Amendment rights.  
 24 Plaintiffs have not and cannot allege that such actions are illegal or constitute other established  
 25

---

26 <sup>20</sup> Complaint, p. 15:15-16.  
 27 <sup>21</sup> Complaint, p. 16, para. 57.  
 28 <sup>22</sup> Complaint, p. 16, para. 58.  
<sup>23</sup> Complaint, p. 16, para. 59.

1 exceptions to freedom of speech and expression. Plaintiffs' complain about a brochure Dr.  
 2 Abdulhadi allegedly drafted without explaining how this violates their civil rights. Absurdly, the  
 3 very paragraph in which this allegation appears admits that the image complained about by the  
 4 nebulously defined "Jewish Community" was never even painted after objections were voiced.<sup>24</sup>  
 5 Plaintiffs' implicit claim that they represent this undefined "Jewish Community" is unsupported,  
 6 and is impossible to assess since Plaintiffs fail to identify which of them objected to the mural at  
 7 all. It is equally mystifying how Plaintiffs could have been harmed by a brochure that Plaintiffs  
 8 admit was never even published.  
 9

10 Finally, the allegation that Dr. Abdulhadi was "integrally involved" with other academic  
 11 conferences is fatally vague. In addition to Plaintiffs' inevitable inability to overcome Dr.  
 12 Abdulhadi's constitutional protections in participating in academic conferences, the Complaint  
 13 does not point to a single specific act by Dr. Abdulhadi that violated their civil rights. Labels  
 14 and conclusions such as "integrally involved" are insufficient to survive a motion to dismiss.  
 15 Bare assertions and conclusory allegations that amount only to a formulaic recitation of the  
 16 elements of a claim are insufficient. Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). Although here  
 17 plaintiffs stunningly failed to do even that.) "[F]or a complaint to survive a motion to dismiss,  
 18 the non-conclusory 'factual content' and reasonable inferences from content, must be plausibly  
 19 suggestive of a claim entitling the plaintiff to relief." Moss v. United States Secret Service 572  
 20 F.3d 969, 969 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2009). *Also see al-Kidd v. Ashcroft*, 580 F.3d, 949, 956 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2009).

21  
 22 3) Research in the Middle East  
 23

24 Plaintiffs attack an academic who is a recognized expert on Palestinian, Arab, Muslim  
 25

---

26  
 27 <sup>24</sup> Complaint, p. 16:15-16.  
 28

1 and Middle East affairs for traveling to the Middle East to conduct her research.<sup>25</sup> Plaintiffs  
 2 complain that this research included meetings with representatives of designated terrorist  
 3 organizations. Dr. Abdulhadi's role as an academic is to conduct research even if that research  
 4 involves meeting and interviewing individuals who Plaintiffs do not like.<sup>26</sup> The First  
 5 Amendment also protects such actions. Further, Plaintiffs never explain how they were harmed  
 6 by Dr. Abdulhadi meeting with people they do not like.

8           4)    Student Exchange Program

9           Allegations that Dr. Abdulhadi arranged a student exchange program are not actionable  
 10 for the same reasons as her research in the Middle East. Namely, there are no allegations that  
 11 this exchange program harmed Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs may argue that this program puts them in  
 12 danger. However, if this were the standard, then pro-Palestinian students could sue CSU for  
 13 allowing former IDF soldier Shachar Ben-David to attend SFSU (paragraph 130 of the  
 14 Complaint concedes that this individual attended SFSU). If the standard, which the Plaintiffs  
 15 insist that the Court adopt were to be implemented, then students who sympathize with Palestine  
 16 could have sued SFSU for allowing Mayor Barkat to come to campus and there should be an  
 17 additional lawsuit filed in this matter.

20           5)    Faculty Adviser of GUPS

21           Although Plaintiffs allege that some students who were members of GUPS were

---

24  
 25           <sup>25</sup> Complaint, p. 52, par. 133.

26           <sup>26</sup> Plaintiffs do not state whether they are similarly upset that one of their counsel has also  
 27           “interviewed leaders of terrorist organizations, Hamas, al Aqsa, Islamic Jihad . . .” Video of  
 28           Brooke Goldstein speech, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iSm22DhzC6k> 28:37-28:43 , last  
 accessed August 18, 2017

1 disciplined as the result of a May 2002 incident<sup>27</sup> and allege various other wrongdoings against  
2 GUPS throughout the Complaint<sup>28</sup>, the Complaint provides no allegations that Dr. Abdulhadi  
3 was involved in these alleged wrongdoings. Moreover, there is no possible amendment that  
4 could save this allegation, since Dr. Abdulhadi did not even joined the faculty until 2007, five  
5 years after this alleged incident. As such, there is no legal or factual basis to impute GUPS'  
6 alleged misconduct to Dr. Abdulhadi.  
7

## 6) Politicizing Grades

In addition to being pled on information and belief, there are no explanations of how the Plaintiffs were harmed by this alleged practice in Dr. Abdulhadi's class. What is more, there are no allegations that any of Plaintiffs were even in any of Dr. Abdulhadi's classes. Strikingly, not even these Plaintiffs alleged that any such discrimination had a religious basis. As such, Plaintiffs have failed to allege prejudice and therefore, have not established standing to sue on this ground.

**D) Dr. Abdulhadi Enjoys Qualified Immunity From Liability for the First Four Causes of Action**

19 As a state official performing discretionary functions, even when sued as an individual  
20 for alleged violations of civil rights, Dr. Abdulhadi is entitled to qualified immunity because her  
21 conduct has not violated “clearly established statutory or constitutional civil rights of which a  
22 reasonable person would have known.” Moss v. United States Secret Service, 711 F.3d 941, 956  
23 (9th Cir. 2013), quoting Harlow v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800, 818 (1982). Yet here Plaintiffs are  
24  
25 hard-pressed to articulate any colorable civil rights theory, and are forced to import (and to

<sup>27</sup> Complaint p. 14, para. 52.

<sup>27</sup> See e.g. Complaint p. 2, para 6 wherein Plaintiffs allege that GUPS “commandeered the [Barakat] event and shut it down.”

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

Case No. 3:17-CV-03511-WHO

1 misstate and exaggerate, at that) a State Department definition which has never been applied by a  
 2 court in an academic context. The question for this Court is whether, taken in the light most  
 3 favorable to Plaintiffs, a constitutional right has actually been violated, and, if so, “whether the  
 4 right was *clearly established in light of the specific context of the case.*” al-Kidd, *id.*, at 964  
 5 (emphasis added.) There is simply no way for the Plaintiffs to meet the first prong of al-Kidd as  
 6 to Dr. Abdulhadi, much less the second prong, since every act Dr. Abdulhadi is alleged to have  
 7 committed is discretionary, and not ministerial. Harlow at 816.

8  
 9 Although the question of qualified immunity normally arises at summary judgment, it can  
 10 and should be granted on a 12(B)(6) motion where the facts are established on the face of the  
 11 complaint without further need for factual review. Groten v. California, 251 F.3d 844, 851 (9th  
 12 Cir. 2001). Compare Williams v. Alabama State Univ., 102 F.3d 1179, 1182 (11th Cir. 1997)  
 13 with Courtright v. City of Battle Creek, 839 F.3d 513, 518 (6th Cir. 2016).

14  
 15 **E) In Her Individual Capacity Dr. Abdulhadi Enjoys Qualified Immunity From  
 16 Liability for the Sixth Cause of Action Because Declaratory Judgement via  
 17 the Declaratory Judgement Act and via 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Are Identical.**

18 That the Sixth Cause of Action seeks declaratory relief under the Declaratory Judgment  
 19 Act rather than 42 U.S.C. §1983 does not allow plaintiffs to strip Dr. Abdulhadi of her qualified  
 20 immunity protections because the Declaratory Judgement Act merely authorizes a remedy where  
 21 another cognizable violation has occurred. It cannot be used to bootstrap jurisdiction where this  
 22 is none. The Act is a “procedural device that was designed to provide a new remedy to the  
 23 federal courts’ arsenal” in a case of actual controversy. It does not, by itself, confer jurisdiction  
 24 on a court to hear a particular case. Chevron Corp. v. Camacho Naranjo, 667 F.3d 232, 244-245  
 25 (2nd Cir. 2012) [declaratory judgment requires an independent, separate, valid legal predicate].  
 26  
 27 Accord, Del Monte Int’l GmbH v. Del Monte Corp., 995 F.Supp.2d 1107, 1124 (C.D. Cal.  
 28

---

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

1 2014); Hummel v. Northwest Trustee Servs. 180 F.Supp.3d 798, 810 (W.D. Wash. 2016)

2 Thus, the failures fatal to the first four causes of action are also fatal to the sixth  
3 purported cause of action.

4 **F) Plaintiffs Fail to Establish Subject Matter Jurisdiction.**

5 The essential allegation upon which Plaintiffs base their complaint is the allegation that  
6 Defendants engaged in anti-Semitic actions.<sup>29</sup> In this regard, Plaintiffs rely upon a distorted<sup>30</sup>  
7 U.S. State Department definition of anti-Semitism.<sup>31</sup> At a basic level, the definition is not an  
8 element of any cause of action and is thus irrelevant and subject to a motion to strike (which Dr.  
9 Abdulhadi has also filed concurrently with the present motion).

10 Plaintiffs assert six purported causes of action. Yet, Plaintiffs explicitly exclude Dr.  
11 Abdulhadi from the first five causes of action. Since Plaintiffs do not identify Dr. Abdulhadi as  
12 a party in the Complaint, Dr. Abdulhadi does not have adequate notice as to whether “all  
13 defendants” includes Dr. Abdulhadi. Nothing in the Complaint indicates that Dr. Abdulhadi has  
14 injured any constitutional right of the plaintiffs, *at all*, much less that she will injure the  
15 plaintiffs’ constitutional rights imminently or otherwise.

16 **1) Plaintiffs’ Cause of Action for Declaratory Relief Fails to State an  
17 Actual Controversy.**

18 The Declaratory Judgment Act does not confer an independent basis for federal court  
19 jurisdiction. Skelly Oil v. Phillips Petroleum, 339 US 667, 671-72 (1950). A viable claim under  
20

---

21 25 <sup>29</sup> See Generally Complaint, p. 11:1 to 16: 28.

22 26 <sup>30</sup> As explained at length in Dr. Abdulhadi’s accompanying Motion to Strike, Plaintiffs’  
misrepresent the U.S. State Department definition of anti-Semitism in their Complaint.

27 27 <sup>31</sup> Complaint, p. 10:8-27.

1 the Declaratory Judgment Act requires that the face of the complaint establish subject matter  
 2 jurisdiction. Heimann v. National Elevator, 187 F.3d 493, 510-11 (5th Cir. 1999).

3       A party seeking declaratory relief must establish an actual controversy. Calderon v.  
 4 Ashmus, 523 US 740, 745 (1998). An actual controversy is a substantial dispute “between  
 5 parties having adverse legal interests, of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance  
 6 of a declaratory judgment.” Maryland Casualty v. Pacific Coal, 312 US 270, 273 (1941). In  
 7 other words, an actual controversy is inextricably tied to concrete and demonstrable injuries.  
 8 Biodiversity Legal v. Badgley, 309 F.3d 1166, 1172 (9th Cir. 2002). The Complaint utterly fails  
 9 to establish an actual controversy between Plaintiffs and Dr. Abdulhadi.

10      With respect to Dr. Abdulhadi, the subject complaint contains limited allegations which  
 11 were summarized *supra* at pp. 14-16.

12      The stated allegations, even if assumed to be true, are entirely unmoored from any  
 13 claimed statutory or constitutional violation and fail to establish any statutory or constitutional  
 14 injury suffered by Plaintiffs at the hands of Dr. Abdulhadi.

15      In other words, the stated allegations have no material or concrete application to a  
 16 justiciable controversy. Broadly read, the Complaint simply alleges that Plaintiffs and Dr.  
 17 Abdulhadi share different political views that largely concern the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.  
 18 Needless to say, political speech is afforded First Amendment protection. Buckley v. Valeo, 424  
 19 US 1, 14 (1976). That speech is especially important on a college campus. See, e.g., Healy v.  
 20 James, 408 U.S. 169, I 80 (1972); Keyishian v. Bd. of Regents, Univ. of State of N.Y., 385 U.S.  
 21 589, 603 (1967); Sweezy v. State of New Hampshire, 354 U.S. 234, 250 (1957). For First  
 22 Amendment purposes “civil liability...is treated no less stringently than direct regulation on  
 23 speech.” In re Orthopedic Bone Screw Litigation, 193 F.3d 781, 792 (3rd Cir. 1999).

---

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

1 “[R]equiring [a defendant] to stand trial… predicated solely on [the defendants’] exercise of its  
2 First Amendment freedoms could generally chill the exercise of the freedom of association by  
3 those who wish to contribute to, attend meetings of, and otherwise associate with…organizations  
4 that engage in public advocacy and debate.” In re Asbestos School Litigation, 46 F.3d 1284,  
5 1295-96 (3rd Cir. 1994).

**2) The Plaintiffs Lack Standing to Bring a Claim for Declaratory Relief Against Dr. Abdulhadi.**

To bring a claim for equitable relief, each plaintiff must individually establish that he or she has standing with respect to both damages and equitable relief. Hodgers-Durgin v. De La Vina, 199 F.3d 1037, 1040-1042 (9th Cir. 1999). All plaintiffs seeking equitable relief must show that (1) they are likely to suffer future injury; (2) they are likely to suffer such injury at the hands of the defendant against whom such relief has been sought; and (3) that the relief sought will likely prevent such injury from occurring. Cone Corp. v. Florida Dep’t of Transp., 921 F.2d 1190, 1203-1204 (11th Cir. 1991) [citing, *inter alia*, Whitmore v. Arkansas, 495 U.S. 149, 155-156 (1990)]. Since none of the Plaintiffs can even show that Dr. Abdulhadi has injured them *at all*, they cannot establish that she will injure them in the future. They therefore lack standing to bring a claim for declaratory judgment. Cone, *supra*, at 1205.

21       Further, standing to seek injunctive relief requires not only injury-in-fact, traceability of  
22 causation, and redressability. It also requires a sufficient likelihood that each plaintiff will be  
23 wronged in a similar way in the future. See, Ervine v. Desert View Regional Medical Center  
24 Holdings, LLC, 753 F.2d 862, 867 (9th Cir. 2014), denying standing where the plaintiff could  
25 not establish a real and immediate threat of future similar harm.  
26

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

1 At heart, Plaintiffs' claim is that, by being a member of the SFSU's Ethnic Studies  
 2 faculty and by participating in university-sanctioned academic activities, Dr. Abdulhadi is  
 3 inherently injuring them.  
 4

5 Even assuming that Plaintiff's allegations have merit, Plaintiffs are claiming that Dr.  
 6 Abdulhadi's participation in university-sanctioned academic activity is an injury to the *Plaintiffs'*  
 7 First Amendment rights. This is presumably because the Plaintiffs disagree with Dr. Abdulhadi's  
 8 views, the positions espoused by conferences she attended, or the organizations with which she  
 9 has, in an official capacity, fostered collaboration with on behalf of SFSU.  
 10

11 Authorized academic activity is not an injury. Dr. Abdulhadi's activity does not interfere  
 12 with Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights at all. Her speech does not suppress theirs. Neither does  
 13 Dr. Abdulhadi's activity deprive Plaintiffs of equal protection of the laws. The continuation of  
 14 Dr. Abdulhadi's academic activity cannot injure plaintiffs in the future. Injunctive relief is  
 15 unavailable to defendants who cannot show a likelihood of future harm, City of Los Angeles v.  
 16 Lyons, 461 U.S. 95, 105 (1983), and for declaratory relief, such a case is unripe and cannot be  
 17 heard. Abbott Labs. v. Gardner, 387 U.S. 136, 148 (1967).  
 18

19  
 20       **3) Plaintiffs' Purported Sixth Cause of Action Fails to Provide Fair  
                  Notice of the Basis for Relief.**

21 The Complaint although lengthy, utterly fails to charge Dr. Abdulhadi with actionable  
 22 misconduct and fails to connect Dr. Abdulhadi to any harm Plaintiffs may have suffered.  
 23 Accordingly, the Complaint fails to give fair notice to Dr. Abdulhadi of the basis for any liability  
 24 or damage claim and should be dismissed. *See* pp. 9-10, *supra*.  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

---

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

**G) The Eleventh Amendment Bars Plaintiffs' Monetary Claims Against Dr. Abdulhadi.**

Assuming arguendo that Plaintiffs have stated a claim against Dr. Abdulhadi and have named her as a defendant, Plaintiffs may only maintain an action for prospective relief. Ex parte Young, 209 U.S. 123 (1908) permits Plaintiffs to seek to bar state officials from enforcing an unconstitutional state laws or policies. Id., at 160 and 166. In application, Ex parte Young authorizes actions for prospective equitable relief against state officials acting in their official capacities. Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police, 491 U.S. 58, 71 & fn 10 (1989); Jackson v. Hayakawa, 682 F.2d 1344, 1351 (9th Cir. 1982). In this regard, the application of Ex parte Young “has been tailored to conform as precisely as possible to those specific situations in which... a violation of federal law by a state official is ongoing as opposed to cases in which federal law has been violated at one time or over a period of time in the past....” Papasan v. Allain, 478 U.S. 265, 276-77 (1986). In other words, a plaintiff is not entitled to declaratory relief absent a defendant’s ongoing violation of federal law – i.e., a defendant’s past misconduct does not trigger a right of action under the Declaratory Judgment Act because “the issuance of a declaratory judgment in these circumstances would have much the same effect as a full-fledged award of damages or restitution by the federal court, the latter kinds of relief being of course prohibited by the Eleventh Amendment.” Green v. Mansour, 474 U.S. 64, 64 & 73 (1985).

In this case, the face of Plaintiffs' Complaint demonstrates that claims against Dr. Abdulhadi fall outside the protective ambit of Ex parte Young. That is to say, all the allegations that reference Dr. Abdulhadi pertain strictly to past events. Generally speaking, Plaintiffs allege

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

1 that Dr. Abdulhadi engaged in past political speech and association activities.<sup>32</sup> Suffice it to say,  
2 the Complaint is devoid of allegations of ongoing and continuous misconduct of the type that is  
3 necessary to trigger Ex parte Young protection. Absent ongoing and continuous violations of  
4 federal law, Plaintiffs are not entitled to any form of relief against Dr. Abdulhadi as the  
5 Complaint is currently pled or could be reasonably amended. Under these circumstances,  
6 Plaintiffs' Complaint should be dismissed insofar as it asserts official capacity claims against Dr.  
7 Abdulhadi.  
8

10 A state official acts in an official capacity when the official acts as an authorized agent  
11 of the state. A state official acts in an individual capacity when the official acts outside the  
12 scope of official duties. Nix v. Norman, 879 F.2d 429, 431 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1989).

13        Although the Complaint is silent as to Dr. Abduhadi’s official and individual capacities,  
14 the Complaint indicates that the other individual defendants are named in both official and  
15 individual capacities.<sup>33</sup> In any event, Plaintiffs’ Complaint reflects threshold allegations that link  
16 Dr. Abdulhadi to CSU in her official capacity as an SFSU associate professor and faculty  
17 advisor.<sup>34</sup> Moreover, Plaintiffs’ Complaint is based upon allegations that link Dr. Abdulhadi to  
18 state sanctioned events and employment positions that necessarily trigger official duties.<sup>35</sup>  
19  
20 Accordingly, Plaintiffs have no viable individual capacity claims because their Complaint is  
21 premised upon the allegation that Dr. Abdulhadi acted as a CSU agent. As such, Plaintiffs’  
22 Complaint is in all respects a suit against CSU – i.e., a suit against the State of California.  
23

<sup>25</sup> <sup>32</sup> Complaint, pp. 15:14-16:22; 23:7-9; 43:19-21; 44:25-27; 52:1-53:17.

<sup>33</sup> Complaint, p. 1, fn. 1.

<sup>26</sup> <sup>34</sup> Complaint, p. 14:18-19.

<sup>35</sup> Complaint, p. 52:16-18; p. 53:6-20.

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

1 Mitchell v. Los Angeles Community College District, 861 F.2d 198, 201 (9th Cir. 1988) and  
 2 Jackson, *supra* at 1350. For this added reason, the Complaint fails as to Dr. Abdulhadi.  
 3

4 **H) Plaintiffs Do Not Deserve to Leave to Amend.**

5 FRCP 15(a)(2) provides that the “court should freely give leave [to amend] when justice  
 6 so requires.” (emphasis added). District Courts generally consider four factors in deciding  
 7 whether to deny leave to amend: “bad faith, undue delay, prejudice to the opposing party, and the  
 8 futility of amendment.” Kaplan v. Rose, 49 F.3d 1363, 1370 (9th Cir. 1994); Bahn v. Korean  
 9 Airlines Co. (In re Korean Air Lines Co.), 642 F.3d 685, 701 (9th Cir. 2011).  
 10

11 Plaintiffs have not only failed to even include Dr. Abdulhadi as a defendant, they seek  
 12 relief without asserting a single actual cause of action against her. Furthermore, Plaintiffs have  
 13 littered the Complaint with invective that is utterly irrelevant to the gravamen of the Complaint  
 14 (i.e. the Mayor Barkat incident and Hillel’s exclusion from the “Know Your Rights” Fair). What  
 15 is more, the allegations against Dr. Abdulhadi ironically (yet revealingly) seek to do the very  
 16 thing that Plaintiffs claim to have suffered at SFSU: deny Dr. Abdulhadi her freedom of  
 17 expression. Such hypocrisy in pleading, even at this early stage, should be abjured. Since  
 18 Plaintiffs fall so short of meeting the applicable pleading standards, granting leave to amend  
 19 would be futile and would frustrate, rather than serve the ends of justice by continuing to harass  
 20 Dr. Abdulhadi for constitutionally protected acts and smear her reputation. Accordingly, the  
 21 Court should grant the present Motion without leave to amend.  
 22

23 **III) CONCLUSION**

24 Plaintiffs appear to have forgotten the very purpose of the academy. Namely that  
 25 differing opinions and viewpoints are expressed on university campuses. Such differences  
 26 should be debated and embraced rather than litigated. Plaintiffs cloak this in a civil rights  
 27

---

28 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT

1 lawsuit claiming that their First Amendment rights have been violated. Ironically, however, once  
2 one scratches the surface, it becomes abundantly clear that it is in fact the Plaintiffs who seek to  
3 gain the upper hand in a political debate by demanding that this Court suppress Dr. Abdulhadi's  
4 First Amendment rights.  
5

6 DATED: August 21, 2017 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED

7 **LAW OFFICE OF MARK ALLEN KLEIMAN**

8  
9 By: /s/ Mark Allen Kleiman, Esq.

10 Mark Allen Kleiman, Esq.

11 **LAW OFFICES OF BEN GHARAGOZLI**  
12 Ben Gharagozli, Esq.

13 **GAVIN, CUNNINGHAM & HUNTER**  
14 Alan F. Hunter, Esq.  
15 Elizabeth Gong Landess, Esq.  
16 Attorneys for Dr. Abdulhadi

17 **LAW OFFICE OF ELIOT LEE GROSSMAN**  
18 Eliot Lee, Grossman, Esq.  
19 Of Counsel

---

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT